

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 20-32 are pending. Claims 20, 24, 28 and 32 are independent and are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the Specification as originally filed.

Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 32 was rejected in the Office Action as allegedly failing to comply with the written description.

First, the Office Action alleged the claim 32 limitation, “. . . when the media is found in the database . . .” is not supported in the specification.”

Applicants have amended to claim element to overcome the rejection. Claim 32 now recites, “. . . address of the server retrieved from the database . . .” That is, based on the generated key data, the CD database is retrieved. The server address (retrieval destination) for a database other than the CD database in the computer can be accessed. When information

relating to the CD corresponding to the database is obtained by the retrieval, such obtained information is used to access the server database other than the CD database in the computer.

Publ. App. par. [0032]-[0033] and FIGS. 2 and 9.

Second, the Office Action alleged the claim 32 limitation, ““accessing . . . the server . . . when the media is found in the database from a search by the key data’ is not supported in the specification.”

As discussed above, the rejected element now recites, “accessing . . . the server based on the address of the server retrieved from the database from a search by the key data.” That is, a CD is loaded on a computer. Retrieval of a CD database (112) by using key data is executed. Data related to contents stored in the CD within the CD database (112) are provided from a server (131). The element is supported in the specification at Publ. App. par. [0038] and FIG. 9.

Applicants note, claim 32 goes on to recite, “obtaining from the server . . . an address of a website relating to the media . . .” That is, the system obtains from the server (131) an address of a relating web (homepage). By connecting the computer to a server (132) of a corresponding homepage, various kinds of data can be obtained.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the §112 rejection of claim 32.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 20-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,751,672 to Yankowski in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,505,160 to Levy, et al.

(hereinafter, merely “Levy”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,893,091 to Hunt, et al.

(hereinafter, merely “Hunt”).

Claim 20 is representative and recites, *inter alia*:

“means for accessing . . . the server based on the address of the server retrieved from the database from a search by the key data

...

means for obtaining from the server . . . an address of a website relating to the media

...

means for accessing . . . the website at the address of the website obtained from the server”

As understood by Applicants, Yankowski relates, in relevant part, to updating a memory in a Compact Disc changer. Information identifying discs stored in a CD changer is stored in a memory. The memory is updated when a CD is loaded which does not have identifying features which are recognized by the CD changer.

Specifically, Yankowski discloses reading the portion of the disc which contains the identifying information or “fingerprint” of the disc. The “fingerprint” is compared to the stored “fingerprints.” If the “fingerprint” is found, the CD changer operates in a conventional manner and awaits the next disc selection. If the “fingerprint” is not found in the CD changer’s database, the user is asked if the disc is to be played or the data is to be updated from a remote database.

Yankowski, col. 8, lines 18-32 and FIGS. 4A-4B.

Thus, in relevant part, Yankowski updates the local database when the “fingerprint” of the disc is not found in the local database. That is, when no data can be retrieved from the local database of Yankowski, then the remote database is contacted to update the local database. Conversely, the local database is not updated if the “fingerprint” data is found.

In contrast, claim 32 recites, “accessing . . . the server based on the address of the server retrieved from the database from a search by the key data . . . obtaining from the server . . . an address of a website relating to the media . . . accessing . . . the website at the address of the website obtained from the server” Thus, in an aspect of the present invention, the database is updated server address is retrieved from the database, whereas in Yankowski the database is updated when the “fingerprint” is not found. In an aspect of the present invention, a server address already exists in the database and that address is used to find a website address for updates related to the media.

That is, a CD is loaded on a computer. Retrieval of a CD database (112) by using key data is executed. Data related to contents stored in the CD within the CD database (112) are provided from a server (131). The element is supported in the specification at Publ. App. par. [0038] and FIG. 9. The system obtains from the server (131) an address of a relating web (homepage). By connecting the computer to a server (132) of a corresponding homepage, various kinds of data can be obtained. Publ. App. pars. [0032]-[0039] and FIG. 9.

Levy and Hunt do not add the element missing from Yankowski.

Applicants submit that Yankowski, Levy, and Hunt, taken either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the above identified features of claim 20.

Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 20 is patentable.

Independent claims 24, 28, and 32 are believed patentable for substantially the same reasons as claim 20.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent on an independent claim discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By



Paul A. Levy
Reg. No. 45,748
(212) 588-0800